DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 223 CS 210 695

AUTHOR Whitehead, Sandra
TITLE Arab Portrayals in U.S. and British News Magazines: A Comparative Analysis.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Arabs; Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Context; *Cultural Images; Economic Factors; Ethnic Stereotypes; Foreign Countries; Ideology; International Relations; Mass Media; *Mass Media Effects; Media Research; *Periodicals; Political Attitudes; Press Opinion
IDENTIFIERS Economist (The); Great Britain; Israel; *Media Bias; Media Role; *Newsmagazines; Time Magazine; United States

ABSTRACT

A study examined the influence of national political and economic interests, culture, and history on the portrayal of Arabs in two weekly news magazines. Sample articles from the American weekly "Time" magazine and the British weekly "The Economist" were examined for coverage of the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war and the June 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon. The comparative content analysis consisted of (1) an examination of portrayals of Arabs in British and American news magazines, (2) an examination of the cultural-political-economic bases of these portrayals, and (3) a search for evidence of ideological links between these bases and the media's portrayal of Arabs. The Arab characterizations were examined across four major categories: Arab referents, general source of attribution, nationality of source, and favorable/unfavorable direction. The Arab characterizations in each country's magazine were expected to be distinctive to the extent that they were affected by the cultural-political-economic situations out of which they arose and to the extent that the cultures and interests of the nations differ. Results showed a more diversified portrayal of Arabs in "The Economist" in 1973 than in 1982; however, more diversity had been expected in the British magazine than actually existed. Indications were found of ideological links between cultural-political-economic factors of the two nations and the portrayal of Arabs in their media. The British historical role as a colonizer, as well as American and British dependency on Arab oil appeared to have influenced the Arab portrayals. (Tables of data and 54 footnotes are appended.) (Author/NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283223

Markham Competition

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Arab Portrayals in U.S. and British News Magazines: A Comparative Analysis

By

Sandra Whitehead

Marquette University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra Whitehead

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 210695

Arab Portrayals in U.S. and British News Magazines:

A Comparative Analysis

Scholars have emphasized the importance of identifying the situation out of which media portrayals arise and recognizing the interests those portrayals serve. This preliminary study examines the influence of national political and economic interests, culture, and history on Arab portrayals in two news magazines.

This is a comparative content analysis of Arab portrayals in an American weekly news magazine (Time) and a British weekly news magazine (The Economist). Publication dates for the sampled articles cluster around the October 1973 war and the June 1982 invasion of Lebanon.

The analysis is comprised of three steps: (1) an examination of portrayals of Arabs in British and American news magazines; (2) an examination of the cultural-political-economic bases of these portrayals; and (3) a search for evidence of ideological links between these bases and the media's portrayal of Arabs. The Arab portrayals in each country's magazine were expected to be distinctive to the extent that they are colored by the cultural-political-economic situations out of which they arose and to the extent the cultures and interests of the nations differ.

The Arab portrayals were examined across four major categories: Arab referents, general source of attribution, nationality of source, and favorable/unfavorable direction.

Indications were found of ideological links between cultural-political-economic factors of the nations and the portrayal of Arabs in their media. British historical role as a colonizer, and American and British dependency on Arab oil appeared to have influenced the Arab portrayals. However, further study is needed in order to confirm these hypotheses.

--30--

Arab Portrayals in U.S. and British News Magazines: A Comparative Analysis

Introduction of the Research Problem

Media observers have noted that the American media are now more powerful and more criticized than ever before. It is demonstrable that they have aroused the public awareness of injustice and the misuse of power. However, some claim that their authority can also mold and channel public opinion according to their own biases and misconceptions.

One area where accusations of bias in news coverage have been made concerns the Arabs and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Partisans for or against the Israelis and partisans for or against the Arabs complain of unfair representation of their side in the American media.

But, American media are not the only media accused of imbalance or unfairness in its coverage of Middle East news. Why, then, is American news coverage the focus of such worldwide concern? Nieman Fellow Mustafa Gursel, Athens correspondent for Istanbul's Milliyet newspaper, said, "It is because of the importance of the United States media--an importance which cannot be overstated."[1] He attributed this importance to Washington's role as a world policy maker. He asserted that the media play a significant role in conditioning public opinion and that public opinion is eventually reflected in Washington's policies. Likewise, Israeli journalist Leon Hadar, in his study of Mid-East coverage in the New York Times, claimed the Times has significant influence on policy makers. He said that Israeli officials

"see a direct line between an editorial in the Times and a vote in Congress on arms to Israel."[2]

Also, America has a special role among the nations as the world's arbitrator, according to David Newsom, former Under Secretary of State and director of the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy at Georgetown University. He said:

> Our people are seen by those outside of the United States as a nation of jurors before which other peoples bring their problems and their points of view, seeking approbation and the support of the American public.[3]

People all over the world are concerned about what Americans think, he added.

Many media analysts agree that the print and broadcast media are powerful instruments in shaping American attitudes and public opinion. Edmund Ghareeb, in his review of the distortion and under-representation of the Arab in American media, said that Middle East news coverage extends far beyond reporting the facts and into the realm of shaping perceptions.[4] He said this power to shape perceptions exists because the average American is less interested in foreign than domestic issues, that minority views are rarely published, and that the Middle East is an area about which the public has little education. Former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Michael O'Neill, also recognized the role of media in constructing our perceptions.

> The national media are now no longer just observers and messengers but lead actions in government, creating, shaping, and often distorting the informational base of decision-making.[5]

The ability of the press to shape public perceptions is particularly strong regarding foreign issues. In foreign affairs, the news media serve as the primary, if not the exclusive, source of information for its audience.

Most readers will not question the media on issues with which they are unfamiliar, nor will they attempt to find other sources of information on the subject.

In addition to American media's role in shaping public opinion in the United States, it has considerable influence on public opinion in other nations. That is because American media is ubiquitous around the world. Whether direct to readers or indirect to foreign media, American print merchants have established themselves as leading currents in the global flow of information. No country has approached the United States in sheer volume or scope of print material distributed externally.[6]

The effects of media images on its audiences have been emphasized by many scholars. Mass communications researcher Alexis Tan, citing the function of mass media to extend our knowledge of the environment beyond people, places, objects, and events that we can directly experience, asserted that "we rely on pictures presented in media as guides for our perceptions of the world."[7] A basic assumption, according to Tan, is that the media are able to determine one's perceptions about the facts, norms, and values of society through selective presentations and by emphasizing certain themes.

S. Ball-Rokeach and M. DeFleur suggest that audience dependency on media information is an ubiquitous condition in modern society.[8] Thus, the media system has gained the capacity for widespread effects because it has become the dominant vehicle for defining and explaining the expanded social environment of modern societies.

Awareness of the important role media play in shaping our perceptions leads to concerns about the images our media project. What are they? Where do they come from? To what extent are newsmen and news executives, the gatekeepers of the news who decide on story priorities and assign reporters to

cover them, simply feeding preconceived images and stereotypes to their readers? Where do distorted images come from? How do American political and economic interests influence the media portrayals of foreign nations? To what extent are American media's portrayal of Arabs a projection of our own cultural and political biases?

The purpose of this paper is to examine influences on American media portrayals of Arabs. Influences are explored in a comparative content analysis of both British and American weekly news magazines. It is comprised of three steps: (1) an examination of portrayals of Arabs in British and American news magazines; (2) an examination of the cultural-political-economic bases of these portrayals; and (3) a search for evidence of ideological links between these bases and the media's portrayals of Arabs. The Arab portrayals in each country's magazines were expected to be distinctive to the extent that they are colored by the respective cultural-political-economic influences out of which they arose and to the extent the cultures and interests of the nations differ.

Conceptual Framework

Edward Said, in his book, Covering Islam, stressed the importance of identifying the situation out of which media portrayals arise and of recognizing the interests those portrayals serve.

> Once we grasp the sheer power and the subjective components of interpretation, and once we recognize that many of the things we know are ours in more ways than we normally admit, we are well on our way to disposing of some naivete, a great deal of bad faith, and many myths about ourselves and the world we live in.[5]

For example, Said cites American foreign policy and defense interests as well as economic interests as important factors in shaping American media portrayals. Said posits a convincing case for the direct involvement of the

academy, the government, and the media in shaping American perceptions. First, he examines the interests of U.S. corporations and the government and then he explains how measures are taken to ensure those interests are sustained. He says this is done by perpetuating the perceptions of the West's adversary relationship with Islam. "Our" American lifestyles became threatened by "them."

Although Said does not subscribe to a conspiracy theory, he builds a model of how government and corporate interests influence the development of such perceptions. He explains that corporations and the government have created the need for "experts" on Islam and the Middle East, and that they have turned to academia for those needs. Consequently, they have provided funding, particularly in economic and strategic fields, for expanding programs in Middle East studies. What has developed over time is a corporate-government-university network which dominates all discourse on Islam in the West. Said stresses the importance of recognizing this situation and recognizing its influence of the media's portrayals of Arabs.

Said further traces the origins of our perceptions of Islam to the ethnocentrism of contemporary American society. He explains how this ethnocentrism unconsciously translates into misinterpretations of reality by causing a self-blinding which shields us from introspective scrutiny. Thus, he contends that by explaining the hostage crisis by instant generalizations such as "the return of Islam" and "the bazaar mentality," the American media ignores an examination of the United States' policy and its effects which contributed to development of the crisis.

He also attributes part of the problem with American reporting about the Middle East to our history. "There was no transition in American awareness of Islam and Arabs, unlike the French and British colonial experiences which brought them into direct contact with Islam over a lengthy period."[10]

Likewise, Janice Monti Belkaoui's study of images of Arabs and Israelis in the prestige press correlates American interests with Arab and Israeli images. In her study, she implemented what she called a manipulative model, in contrast with a laissez-faire model of the image-creation process. The laissez-faire, social responsibility model views news as a result of an objective reporting which supplies the demand for news as effectively as possible. The manipulative model is based on the assumption of an ideological link between economic and political interests and the prestige press. Concerning the Middle East conflict following the 1973 Arab-Israeli war and the oil embargo, the model would reflect the position of the corporate oil interests on the Arab and Israeli images.[11]

Belkaoui's study covered the period between 1966 and 1974. The publications she analyzed were clustered around the June 1967 and the October 1973 wars. She used three magazines and a newspaper as representative of the prestige press; a fifth was used as representative of a mass-appeal press.

Methodologically, she used two categories: an attributional category in which she coded verbs and adverbs synonomous with the words "said," "tell," "ask," etc.; a descriptive category, in which she coded judgmental adjectives and descriptive phrases, such as "the moderate king." The results were compared with Gallup Poll data regarding the Arabs and Israelis for the same period.

The study tested three hypotheses. The findings supported the first, that there was a shift toward a more favorable image of the Arabs in the prestige press. The second hypothesis, regarding a less favorable image for the Israelis, was not supported. She found that there was more bias on the part of American journalism toward Arab than Israeli speakers. This bias was interpreted in terms of cultural differences.

The third hypothesis was validated; the mass-appeal press was slower

to reflect image shifts than the prestige press.

The results of her analysis demonstrate a link of image portrayals to the economic and political interests of the United States. She asserts that America entered into a period of courtship of Arab favor after the 1973 OPEC oil embargo. Her findings support that there were discernable shifts in the portrayals of various Arab leaders from villians in 1967 to heroes in 1974. One can assume there were no significant changes in reality (other than U.S. interests) to warrant such a change. The Arab world in general also reflected the shift in image from loser to winner. Described as an emotional, angrily chanting atomized mass in 1967, the Arab world emerged in the 1970s with a new spirit of achievement, unity, pride, and honor.[12]

Similiarly, George Gerbner asserted that mass media are cultural arms of industrial systems. As such, through selection, treatment, emphasis, and tone, mass media (1) help define their own set of significant realities, (2) structure the agenda of public discourse, and (3) make available dominant perspectives from which realities, priorities, actions, and policies might be viewed.[13] He says that the distinctive ways in which our national media shape our perceptions are often only by-products of our social system's characteristics. It highlights its own set of significant realities from its own social and cultural vantage point. Thus, the American media create images of other nations which reflect American political and economic interests, American culture, and history. Therefore, Arab portrayals in American media should be distinctive from Arab portrayals in other nations' media.

Definitions of "Image" and "Stereotype"

Presumably, an image of a country or race involves a great many factors. Overabstraction, overgeneralization, and oversimplification constitute a "real and present danger" for the governmental leaders and decision-makers as well as for nondecision-makers in the mass public. The belief is widespread

among sociologists and political scientists that national images are dangerous concepts. They lead to improper conclusions and assumptions about other peoples, obstruct international understanding, are basically negative and misleading, and generally cause international (and national) friction.[14]

For example, when many of us hear "Arab" we think "anti-American," "anti-Christian," "cunning," "unfriendly," and "warlike." Yet most of us know little of the Arab people, customs, or accomplishments. Therefore, these images encourage distrust and misunderstanding. Jack Shaheen, a professor of mass communications at Southern Illinois University, listed stereotypes of Arabs he found in American news, television, movies, and literature which he considered particularly misleading. They are:

1. Arabs are extremely wealthy. In fact, the average Arab has a per capita income of approximately $1,000 per year.
2. Arabs are barbaric and uncultured. The Arabs gave the world a religion--Islam--a language and an alphabet. Arab scholars contributed significantly to medicine, mathematics, astronomy, chemistry, and the arts.
3. They are sex maniacs and white slavers. As a Fulbright scholar who traveled extensively in the Middle East, I found most Arab husbands to be monogamous. Slavery is prohibited.
4. They are terrorists. A small minority of Arabs, Israelis, Europeans, Americans, and others resort to terror.
5. They are buying up America. The U.S. Treasury reports that Arab investments in America, compared with those of other groups, are minimal.
6. OPEC equals Arabs. Only seven of the 13 members are Arabs.
7. Iranians are Arabs. Iranians are Persians.[15]

However, how can one think without stereotypes? Thinking itself is abstracting, selecting, focusing on certain dominant characteristics or certain aspects of reality which fit a person's preconceived notions. Thinking, in effect, is stereotyping.[16]

What exactly is a stereotype? "Image" is often said to be roughly equivalent to "stereotype." Many of the viewpoints generally found in the present-day usage of the term come from Walter Lippman, who was perhaps the

first to define and employ the term. Lippman characterizes stereotypes as (1) means of organizing images, (2) fixed, simplified impressions, and (3) salient features chosen to stand for the whole.[17]

Although Lippman suggested that stereotypes refer to things as well as people, that they are essentially negative and that they are essentially incorrect, other scholars disagree. That stereotypes include valid judgments is one of Soloman Asch's contentions.[18] Supporting this contention are H. Meenes,[19] W. Seago,[20] W. Buchanan,[21] and H. Cantril.[22]

The definition of stereotypes that is employed by Dennis Ogawa in his delination of the Japanese-American stereotype is that of Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey[23] that defines a stereotype as a "relatively simple, general, rigid cognition of social groups which blind the individual to the manifold differences among the members of any group--racial, ethnic, age, sex, or social class."[24] It recognizes that stereotypes may be negative or positive. Although they maintain that the stereotype may be based on fact, using this definition, one is able to demonstrate that every stereotype is a distortion to the extent that it does not account for the range of variance that exists within a group in reality. This distortion was Said's concern when he said, "We reduce all aspects of the diverse Moselm world to whatever seems unfamiliar or strange to Americans and call it 'Islam.' Then we treat Islam with hostility or derision."[25]

Functions of Stereotypes

Reasons for this treatment of hostility or derision as well as more favorable treatment of Arabs by the American media can be understood in terms of the functions of stereotypes. These functions provide insight into the image-creation process as it relates to national interests. However, in dealing with the functions of stereotypes, one deals with the speculative, the subjective. There is no barometer to tell exactly what the image-creator

is thinking.

One obvious example of the use of a stereotype is the lazy, servile Black Sambo image which served to justify slavery. The Black Sambo functioned for the white Southern American to protect his slave society.

The development of the Japanese-American stereotype as it appeared in the media and its relation to the political and social occurrences in Anglo-American society suggests how stereotypes function politically.

As Ogawa delineates, the evolution of the Japanese-American stereotype clearly corresponds with the events in the United States-Japanese relations. As Japan has become Americanized, economically and politically, and as it has become one of America's closest Asian allies, the stereotype of the Japanese has become increasingly positive. In a large sense, then, the negative "Jap" stereotype functioned to arouse anti-Japanese sentiment in 1924 to exclude Oriental immigration, and in 1942, to place Japanese in relocation camps.[26]

Similiarly, as Michael Sulieman notes, "In the case of the Palestinians, negative stereotyping has made non-people out of them."[27] This dehumanization functions to relieve our conscience, Suleiman said. By describing the deaths of Palestinians in sanitized and almost noncommittal language and referring to their camps as "terrorist bases," we are able to turn the other way when our ally acts as the aggressor. Also, he said, if the Palestinians are non-people, we can refuse to talk to them and persist in excluding them from any formula for a proposed solution to the problem of where they should live.

Some Japanese writers suggest interesting reasons for positive depictions of Japanese in American media. They suggest that those depictions provide a way for Americans to deal with our own declining importance in the world and our own insecurities. Kosaka Masataka, in a 1980 article in Japan Echo,

says that American Japanologists have recently shown "a tendency to understand Japan's success on a deeper level" than in the past.[28] Citing such books as Ezra Vogel's Japan as Number One, he suggests that Japan's economic success has altered America's judgment of Japan. But, he says that America's new view of Japan is primarily a result of Americans' recent awareness of limits on American ideals and power. He says the American "crisis of confidence" originated in the failure in Vietnam.

In another article on Japan-U.S. relations, Irie Akira says "such phenomena as rising inflation, increasing crime rates in cities, and financial crises of public hospitals have caused Americans to lose confidence in their society."[29] Therefore, the United States no longer requires that Japan recognize her superiority and Japan is no longer considered a "junior partner." But, as Said suggested, rather than look introspectively at America's new and less powerful position in the world, we create an image of another people which functions to explain the new balance in relations. Also, this change in the image of Japanese justifies the American government's effort to encourage Japan to develop its own defense.

Similiarly, Norman Podhoretz, in his Commentary article, "J'Accuse," called the negative stereotype of Israelis which appeared after the Lebanon invasion in 1982 a "cover for an American crisis of confidence."

> Hostility toward Israel is a sure sign of failing faith in and support for the virtues and values of Western civilization in general and of America in particular. How else are we to interpret a political position that, in a conflict between a democracy and its anti-democratic enemies, is so dead set against the democratic side? ...I charge here that the anti-Semitic attacks on Israel which have erupted in recent weeks are a cover. They are a cover for a loss of American nerve. They are a cover for acquienscence in terrorism. They are a cover for the appeasement of totalitarianism. And I accuse all those who have joined in these attacks not merely of anti-Semitism but of the broader sin of faithlessness to the interests of the United States and inded to the values of Western civilization as a whole.[30]

Although other scholars disagree with Podhoretz about the reason for more negative portrayal of Israelis in 1982, they also recognize the potential function of stereotypes as a means of dealing with our own self-image. Syndicated columnist Nick Thimmesch said that coverage of Israel's 1982 Lebanon invasion was an "accurate response by the American media to their news instinct about the deportment of nations using the lethal power of American-supplied weapons."[31] As Henry David Thoreau said about his own tax money, one should be aware of where his allegiances are pledged. In his interpretation, the Israeli images in the U.S. press served as a means for Americans to examine their role in the "slaughter" in the Middle East.

Positive stereotypes also function to serve other national interests. They often result in the manipulation of the minority by the majority. One positive stereotype of the Japanese-American Ogawa cited is the "highly-Americanized" stereotype. This stereotype can possibly serve two functions: one, given the "melting pot" image of America, it affirms that to become an American, one must enter the pot--that is, become assimilated into an American and two, to perpetuate the ethnocentric adulation of white as best.

Characterizing Japanese-Americans as "superior citizens" functions as (1) a justification that white America is non-racist; it demonstrates that a minority group can be accepted and become successful in the United States; and (2) a criterion for other minorities to follow.

Similiarly, with positive images in our media we reward nations most like us. This is partially because we identify with them and, therefore, have more sympathy for their cause. But, perhaps subconsciously, our stereotypes function to encourage "modernization" and "Westernization" of foreign cultures.

For example, Israel, a free society, received the benefits of being judged as a free and highly humane society until 1982 when televised viewing

of unexpected behavior shocked Americans into a reassessment of Israel. On the other hand, when the Syrians killed 20,000 of their own people in Hamma, there was shrugging of the shoulders, a tendency to say, "Well, that's what you expect, right?"[32] Our media simply do not treat many of the horrible incidents of violence in some parts of the world with the same intensity with which it has treated Israeli behavior in the Lebanese War. This is because they failed to live up to the expectations of the stereotypes we had donned on them. We punished them by shifting to negative portrayals of them.

Likewise, one of the reasons given for the more sympathetic view towards the Lebanese after the televising of the bombing in Beirut in 1982 was that the image of the city was "obviously close to home."[33] Journalists like Chancellor and Farrell made evident by their allusions to Beirut in terms of Manhattan that this was no Asian village or Middle East desert. The streets and houses reminded one of lakefront Chicago. In this case, the images functioned to create a feeling of friendliness and sympathy in the American audience for the Lebanese.

Literature Review

Images studies are useful in explaining how the mass media depict a certain subject or issue.[34] In their analysis of the agenda-setting function of media, Kraus and Davis have explained how the media may structure our world for us:

> Television, newspaper, radio, and film seem to have enormous power in shaping public opinion of issues confronting society. By just paying attention to some issues while ignoring others, the mass media, deliberately or otherwise, may set priorities of concern within various sections of the public.[35]

Image studies are useful in another respect. They have "implications for a better understanding of the internal dynamics of media organizations."

The selection of a material to be published, in a newspaper, for example, determines "how images will be shaped and which ones will be emphasized."[36]

A third aspect of image studies is that they have implications for a better understanding of the cultural-political-economic situations in which the images developed. They demonstrate how the images serve the political and economic interests of the nation or culture in which they originated.

Studies of American Media

Since the 1960s, scholars have been interested in image studies of Arabs, press coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and other Middle East coverage in the U.S. press. Most of these studies have linked Arabs to Israel and the Middle East conflict. The bulk of this research focused on four issues: (1) News flow from the Middle East and questions related to coverage: (2) Changes in the direction of favorability/unfavorability of Arab and Israeli images; (3) Comparison of the Arab and Israeli images; and, (4) Sources of anti-Arab and anti-Israeli biases in media coverage.

Two studies which dealt with the questions of news flow and the role of correspondents in the Middle East were done by Mishra and Sreebny respectively. Mishra analyzed the amount of space devoted to Middle East countries in five American media (four newspapers and CBS News) for a period of three weeks in 1971.

He found that Middle East coverage received five percent of the total coverage. Of this, 34 percent concentrated on Israel; 26 percent on Egypt; 16 percent on Iran; and the rest of the Middle Eastern countries had 24 percent.[37]

Sreebny surveyed American correspondents in the Middle East; he said that the area became the "hottest journalistic assignment going" in the 1970s. He found that between 1972 and 1975, American correspondents increased by 50 percent. The survey showed that very few of those possessed a knowledge

of the region's languages; and most believed that a pro-Israeli and anti-Arab bias existed, although less since 1973.[38]

Studies dealing with the other issues (shifts in the direction of favorability/unfavorability of Arab and Israeli images, comparisons of those images, and the sources of bias) reach diverse, sometimes contradictory, conclusions. In four articles on U.S. media coverage of the Middle East, the authors all agree that the American media is important in influencing public opinion and government policy. Also, they all recognize a shift in the media portrayals of Arabs and Israelis between 1967 and 1982. They agree that this shift resulted in a more favorable view of Arabs than previously existed. However, they disagree on exactly when and why this shift occurred. They also disagree in their perceptions of which group, Arabs or Israelis, has the more positive media portrayal. They also disagree on the sources of media bias.

Israeli journalist Leon Hadar, in an examination of The New York Times' Middle East coverage, cited the October 1973 war and the subsequent oil embargo as the point where the Arab portrayal became more positive. Hadar said that the reason the Arab portrayal became more positive was that because of the oil embargo, channels of communication between U.S. and the Arab nations developed. Thus, American media had access to Arab opinion which did not previously exist.[39]

Edmund Ghareeb, in his study of the distortion and under-representation of the Arab in American media agrees with Hadar that the shift in favorability was in 1973. He agreed with Hadar that improved communication with the Arab world was a cause of more positive portrayals of Arabs. He said that improved economic ties were also a factor. However, he pointed out that the oil embargo had its negative effects on Arab portrayals as well by encouraging the portrayal of the greedy, grasping Arab.[40]

Rita Simmon, in her examination of print media's coverage of the war in Lebanon, said the shift to pro-Arab images took place in 1982. Simon examined six of "the leading and most influential" papers in the country, comparing their coverage of the 1975-76 civil war in Lebanon with their coverage of the 1982 Arab-Israeli conflict in Lebanon. The amount of coverage as well as the tone was determined. A judgment was made as to whether the item was "pro-Israel," "neutral," or "anti-Israel."[41]

She concluded, first, that the six major newspapers in the U.S. paid more attention to the 1982 war in Lebanon than they did to the civil war in 1975 and 1976 in which more lives were lost; second, that the ration of front page stories about the Israeli-Lebanon war as opposed to the civil war was higher in the papers whose editorials professed more anti-Israel opinions than in the other papers; third, that The New York Times was most balanced of the six in the amount of headlines and front-page coverage it gave to both wars.

She asserted that the media underplay of the civil war in Lebanon was damaging to the Israeli image when compared to the coverage given the Israeli invasion. She considers this difference in coverage a cause for a positive Arab image after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 as well as a cause for a more negative Israeli image.

Washington-based syndicated columnist Nick Thimmesch agrees with Simon that media treatment of the Israeli invasion in Lebanon and the massacre of Palestinian civilians in West Beirut in 1982 caused a change in media portrayals of Israelis. However, he says the positive shift in Arab portrayals occurred in 1977, after Sadat's trip to Jerusalem. Thimmesch said Sadat did more to rectify the Arab image than any single person. He says that the shift to positive Arab portrayals finally brought reporting on the Middle East into balance.[42]

Ghareeb, however, said that the Arabs are still not covered by the same standards that apply to Europe and Israel. He cites cultural bias, media ignorance of Arab history, and the sophisticated and determined pro-Israel lobby as reasons for media's "failure to cover the Arab world fairly and objectively."[43]

In contrast, both Simon and Hadar say that Israelis must meet an unreasonably high standard in order to get comparable coverage to Arabs. Simon and Hadar both cite differences between Israel and Arab states' willingness to allow access to information as a cause for this imbalance. There is no question that the flow of information in Arab countries is managed by the government. In contrast, Israel is a paragon of sources for a journalist who is seeking diversified information. The result is a growing dependency on the part of journalists on Arab official sources which express unified opinions while concurrently depending on diversified sources with multiple opinions in Israel. Hadar and Simon say that the result is that only positive information comes from Arab countries while negative as well as positive information comes from Israeli sources.

Studies of British Media

Some Americans (and some Middle Easterners) believe that the European press is much better than the American press in providing in-depth, comprehensive coverage of the Middle East. Said supports this contention by contrasting the record of Le Monde's Eric Rouleau and the Guardian's David Hirst--Middle East "experts" of at least 15 or 20 year's standing--with The New York Times' practice of changing its correspondents in the Middle East every two or three years. But, whatever the case of the "quality" press, Edward Mortimer, editorial writer of the London Times, said that the popular press (at least in Britain) "has nothing to envy its American counterparts in rabid anti-Arab and anti-Muslim prejudice."[44]

In two articles concerning the British media's coverage of the Arab-Israeli dispute, Britain, also, stands accused of bias in their portrayals of Arabs and Israelis. In both articles, the bias is traced to Britain's political and economic interests.

British journalist Terence Prittie asserts that there is a trend in the British media towards increased dependence on the Foreign Office for news and views on the Arab-Israeli dispute. He cites four reasons.

1. Because of "oil-price inflation," it has become increasingly expensive to send correspondents to the Middle East. However, embassies are maintained. Therefore, more information is being channelled through the embassy staff.
2. It has become more dangerous for correspondents to work in the Middle East.
3. The British government has shown an increasing inability to protect its subjects abroad.
4. But by far the most operative reason for the growing dependence of the British media on Whitehall has been the evolution of a new British policy towards the Arab-Israeli dispute and its skillful and persistent propagation.[45]

This new policy he is referring to is based on the precept that the settlement of the "Palestinian question" would enable all the other pieces of the Middle East to fall neatly into place. The danger, as Prittie sees it, of the press relying on the Foreign Office for information is the loyalty diplomats feel towards their host countries. Numerically, the number of diplomats who have served in the Embassy in Tel Aviv are greatly outnumbered by the number of diplomats who have served in Arab countries. That fact alone, he claims, causes bias. This influence is further compounded by political and economical interests of the government. Two examples he gives are the arguments that Britain must have her share of Middle East markets "which are just about the most attractive in the world," and that Arab oil is a necessity for

Europe.

Similiarly, Michael Curtis, a professor of political science at Rutgers University, criticizes the London Times for what he calls a "pro-Palestinian bias." He cites the selection of letters printed on the Middle East during the first half of 1974, the acceptance of PLO-sponsored political ads, and the selection of "misleading" photographs as evidence of this bias. He accuses the Times of "treading the shameful road to appeasement" because of their economic interests.[46]

Methodology

Content analysis is the method by which British and American media portrayals of Arabs were examined. Fred Kerlinger said that content analysis is a method of observation in which the investigator takes the messages that people have produced and asks questions of the messages.[47] By emphasizing such an approach, the research is capable of making limited predictions about the behavior of the source and,to a lesser extent, the receiver.[48]

Theoretically, the messages in news publications are overt communication behavior, which analyzed systematically and objectively, may lead to an understanding of social controls. Such controls originally shaped the message, made communicators say what they did, and subsequently influenced people's perceptions and opinions. Thus, the focus will not be just on the mesage per se;[49] it is also on the process and effects of mass communication. Analysis of content should provide indications of how American and British political and economic interests as well as their cultures and histories shape portrayals of Arabs in their media.

Cultural-Political-Economic Factors Influencing Media Portrayals

As Edward Said suggested, in order to understand media portrayals of

national and ethnic groups, one must examine the situation out of which those portrayals arise and recognize the interests they serve. Similiarly, George Gerbner asserted that the distinctive ways national media shape our perceptions are often by-products of our social system's characteristics.

The literature suggests several cultural-political-economic factors which could distinquish American media portrayals from British media portrayals. They are:

1. The United States' role as a world superpower. Consequently, other nations are approached in terms of the need to make policy decision. The role of this factor in shaping American media portrayals is suggested by what David Newsom called "America's special role among nations" (explained on page 2). Similiarly, Mustafa Gursel stressed the importance of Washington's role as a world policy maker (see page 1 above). Also, Gursel and Leon Hadar cite the role of the American media in influencing world policy decisions (page 1 above) as a factor distinquishing it from the media of other nations.
2. The U.S.--Soviet rivalry. Other nations are portrayed as pro- or anti-American and pro- or anti-Soviet. This factor should cause a negative portrayal of nations aligned with the Soviet Union in the American media. Edward Said cites American foreign policy and defense interests as important factors shaping American media portrayals (see page 4).
3. America's lack of contact with Arab nations through history (in contrast to the British experience of lengthy direct contact). This factor should result in a less diversified portrayal of Arabs in the American media than in the British media. Said explains how America, compared to Britain and other European nations, has had little direct contact with Arabs because it did not have a similiar colonial experience (see page 5 above).
4. The ethnocentrism of contemporary American society. This factor should

result in the use of instant generalizations, such as "the return of Islam," instead of deeper analyses of the underlying causes of crisis situations. Said suggested that the generalizations result from an ethnocentrism which shields us from an introspective scrutiny of our foreign policy and causes us to view different cultures as threats to the American way of life (see page 5 above).

5. America's recent decline in importance in the world. This factor should result in a recent increasingly positive portrayal of other peoples. Japanese scholars Kosaka Masataka and Irie Akira, like Said, suggest that, rather than look introspectively at America's new and less powerful position in the world, we create an image of other peoples which functions to explain the new balance in relations (see page 11).
6. America's cultural and political similarities to Israel as well as its political ties with Israel. This factor should result in a dehumanization of Israel's enemies to the extent America is supporting Israel at the time, as suggested by Milton Viorst (see page 13) and Michael Sulieman (see page 10). Likewise, as similiarities between American culture and Arab culture are recognized, Arab portrayals in American media should become more positive, as suggested by Roger Morris (see page 13).

Sampling Procedure

The sample was drawn from The Economist, as a representative of a British weekly news magazine, and Time, as a representative of an American weekly news magazine. Both magazines were chosen because they consistently had the widest circulation in their respective countries of magazines of that genre. According to Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory, 25th edition, The Economist had a 1986 circulation was 169,598. According to the Gale Directory of Publications, 119th edition, Time's circulation for the same period

was 4,832,395. Although the circulations of the two magazines differ, both represent the most widely circulated weekly news magazines in their respective nations.

The periods suggested for this content analysis are the October 1973 war and the June 1982 invasion of Lebanon. They were chosen because both events spawned significant news coverage in both British and American news magazines.

Secondly, those events are cited by scholars as marking both changes in Arab portrayals in the American media and shifts in American political and economic ties with Arab nations. Janice Monti Belkaoui, Edmund Ghareeb, and Leon Hadar cite the October 1973 war as an event possibly causing shifts in media portrayals of Arabs (see page 15 above). Nick Thimmesch and Rita Simon cite a shifting Arab image in American media coverage of the 1982 invasion of Lebanon.

Content Categories

1. The referent: The referent in each case was an Arab, or Arabs, or Arab states. Under this category, the following breakdowns were listed:
   (1) Arab individual: e.g. a leader or person.
   (2) Arabs as an aggregate: e.g. some Arabs in an organization, or a few of them.
   (3) Arabs in general: e.g. whenever the report talked about Arabs generally.
   (4) Arab states: Any Arab state (or states) were listed under this sub-category, unless it was further identified as one of the following:
      1. Ethnic Arabs: e.g. bedouins, Druze, Kurds, etc.
      2. Religious Arabs: e.g. Moselms, Sunni, Shite, Christian, etc.
      3. Other Arabs: e.g. Arabs in America.

This content category is that which was used by Issam Suleiman Mousa in his 1981 study of the Arab portrayal in The New York Times from 1917 to 1947.[50]

This focus may help explain how the press viewed the Arabs: as a homogeneous composite, referred to as "Arabs," or as different ethnic and/or national groups. These data were gathered to test the following hypotheses:

H1: Time magazine reflects a more homogeneous composite portrayal of Arabs than does The Economist.

H2: The Economist reflects a more diversified portrayal of Arabs than does Time.

These hypotheses were suggested by Said (see page 5) as consequences of the absence of direct contact between Americans and Arabs as opposed to its presence in the British/Arab relationship over the years.

Also, America's ethnocentrism explained by Said (see page 5) would result in generalizations in portrayals rather than distinctions which would result from deeper analyses.

2. General source of attribution: Each attribution was analyzed for source report:

(1) An identified source: This dealt with a specified person.

(2) A veiled source: An unidentified source, such as "it was reported...," or "an official said...".

(3) An unascertained source: Neither (1) nor (2) above but, rather, a reporter, news agency, and/or newspaper.

(4) Other.

This content category is found in Mousa's 1981 study. The news sources' categories are useful in determining possible gatekeeping and biases in informational flow.

3. Nationality of attribution source: Each source was analyzed according

to nationality.

This content category is found in Mousa's study.

The analysis of news source nationality will help show the origin of news used by reports. The objective will be to see whether the news sources used were Arab, Israeli, American, or European. This will demonstrate whose story is being told. These data were gathered to test the following hypothesis:

H3: The Economist reflects a higher percentage of Arab sources than does Time.

This hypothesis is suggested by several factors. First, as Said suggested (see page 20), the U.S.--Soviet rivalry would result in limited use of sources from countries aligned with the Soviet Union. Several Arab nations maintain strong ties with the Soviet Union.

Second, America's lack of contact with Arab nations through history would result in less use of Arab sources by the American media than by the British media which has had direct contact with Arabs for many years.

Third, American ethnocentrism cited by Said would result in the use of American "experts" on the Middle East or on Arab culture as sources as opposed to direct Arab sources. Also, this ethnocentrism would result in a focus on the effects of various Arab situations on the U.S., which consequently would call for comments from American rather than Arab sources.

Fourth, America's cultural and political similiarties and ties with Israel would result in less use of Arab sources than Israeli sources when both were available. As Said, Jack Shaheen, and others suggest, the political and economic interests influence American media portrayals of Arabs. Those interests are likely to influence the use of sources as well.

Another factor influencing the use of Arab sources is difficulty for journalists of gaining access. Thimmesch cites government censorship, language barriers and limited access to Arab nations and sources as factors limiting

use of Arab sources.[51]

4. Descriptive image category: This category represents the publications' most direct editorial means of image creation. The data were coded for direction on a three-point scale: favorable (+), neutral (0), and unfavorable (-).

This content category is used in Janice Monti Belkaoui's 1978 study, "Images of Arabs and Israelis in the Prestige Press, 1966-74."[52] However, the definitions of the three-point scale combines Belkaoui's and Mousa's scales:

(+) Favorable: Those attributes which reflect unity, social (and religious) cohension, cooperation, stability, strength, morality, intelligence, success, good deeds, lawfulness, peace-loving, involvement in independence efforts (revolution, freedom fighters), and leadership.

(-) Unfavorable: Those attributes which reflect disunity, social (and religious) conflict, disorganization, instability, weakness, immorality, lack of intelligence, failure, bad deeds, involvement in a terrorizing effort and destruction, disruptors of rules, unlawful, losers, refuse peace, backward, domineering, vengeful, warring, immoral, impractical, stubborn, lacking in leadership.

(0) Neutral: Those attributes which reflect neither favorable nor unfavorable conditions.

This analysis will show whether Arab protrayals in the reports received favorable, unfavorable, or neutral treatment. These data were gathered to test the following hypothesis:

H4: The Economist portrays Arabs more favorably than does Time.

This hypothesis is suggested by Said's comment that a nation's foreign

policy interests influence its media portrayals of other nationalities. America has strong political ties with Israel which Britain does not (at least to the same degree). Therefore, portrayals of Israel's enemies are likely to be less favorable in American media than in British media.

Similiarly, nations (such as Syria) which maintain strong ties with America's rival, the Soviet Union, are less likely to be portrayed favorably in America media than in British media where the rivalry is much weaker.

Also, America's lack of direct contact with Arab nations through much of its history is likely to result in less sympathetic or favorable portrayals of Arabs in American media than in British media.

Analysis and Discussion

Mass media researchers have asserted that media images play a significant role in creating and shaping persceptions. Ball-Rokeach and DeFleur suggest that media influence in shaping perceptions is particularly strong in an area where the audience is dependent on the media as a primary or exclusive source of information. This situation exists for our perceptions of other nations, particulary for nations with which we have little direct contact.

The ability of the press to shape public perceptions leads to concerns about the images projected. Edward Said and others stressed the importance of recognizing the situation out of which those images arise and the interests which they serve.

Said, Belkaoui, and Gerbner assert that our media portrayals of other nations reflect our own political and economic interests, culture, and history. Therefore, each national media system's portrayals of Arab images should be distinctive, shaped by its own social system's characteristics. Examinations of images in media may reveal more about the nation where the image originated

than the nation portrayed. If this is the case, an examination of Arab portrayals in the American media could reveal characteristics of American interests, culture, and history.

Arab Referents

The descriptive analysis of Arab referents is intended to show the amount of press attention given to each referent category. Therefore, differences in the amount of press attention given by each news magazine to the various categories should indicate differences between the ways the two magazines viewed the Arabs: as a homogeneous composite, referred to as "Arabs," or as different ethnic and/or national groups. Because of differences in the cultural-political-economic situations of Britain and the U.S. mentioned above (see page 23), the British news magazine was expected to reflect a more diversified portrayal of Arabs than the American news magazine.

As shown in Apendix 1, Table 1, both magazines named individual Arab states more than any other referent category in both 1973 and 1982. In 1973, besides nations, both magazines referred to Arabs generally more than any other referent group. In 1982, Arabs generally moved to third place in The Economist and fourth place in Time.

A reason for the high frequency of references to nation states is the focus of both news magazines on events of political and economic significance. For example, the emphasis on Saudi Arabi during the October 1973 War's subsequent oil embargo was related to its oil resources. Both magazines analyzed the consequences of the oil embargo on their respective nations.

Nations were also mentioned in both 1973 and 1982 in a military context. Actions and decisions of individual nations in relation to their alliances during the October 1973 War and the 1982 Lebanon invasion were mentioned.

Similiarly, Individuals and Aggregate Arabs (such as the PLO) were

mentioned regarding their actions during the two periods. This reflects event-oriented news coverage in both magazines.

The data supported Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 in 1973, showing a more diversified portrayal of Arabs in The Economist and a more homogeneous portrayal of Arabs in Time. However, the data did not support these hypotheses in 1982. Time's reference to Arabs Generally was significantly greater than The Economist's reference to Arabs Generally in 1973 but not in 1982. Also, The Economist's references to Aggregate Arabs and Individuals was only slightly greater than Time's references to those categories. More diversity had been expected in the British magazine than actually existed.

A chi square test of references to Arabs Generally and the total of all other referents did not reveal a significant difference between the two magazines (significant at the .21 level). However, this is possibly due to the limited size of the sample. Further studies with larger samples may reveal significant differences.

There are several factors that operated in 1982 which would lead to more diversity in American portrayals which were cited by several scholars. Hadar, Ghareeb, Said, Belkaoui, Shaheen, Suleiman, Thimmesch, and Simon all assert that America's relationship with Israel is an important influence on American media portrayals of Arabs. Because of America's involvement in the politics of the Middle East, both as an ally of Israel and as a superpower, American portrayals of Arabs distinquish between "good Arabs" and "bad Arabs." The "good Arabs" are called "moderates." The "bad Arabs" are called "terrorists." Two factors which determine the good/bad distinction are the nations', individuals', or aggregate Arabs' relationships with Israel and with the superpowers. Both Egypt and Jordan were called "moderates." Both nations have been involved, to some degree, in the peace negotiations with Israel. Egypt under Nassar did not enjoy the same treatment in the American media as Egypt under

Sadat. Sadat's overtures to Israel made Egypt a "moderate."

America's rivalry with the Soviet Union also influences the diversification of the American news magazine's portrayal of Arabs. Nations are called "pro-American" or "anti-American" and "pro-Soviet" and "anti-Soviet." For example, Syria was repeatedly referred to as a "Soviet client" in 1973 when it was at war with Israel and received arms from the Soviet Union. The distinction between allied states and non-allied states creates more diversity in media portrayals. Individual nations rather than Arabs Generally are referents as a result.

Another factor which caused the increase in diversity in Arab portrayals in both magazines was the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. This factor was cited by Roger Morris in his article "Beirut--and the Press--Under Siege" in The Columbia Journalism Review (see page 13). Morris noted that Arab portrayals changed as a result of the televising of the violence in Beirut during the invasion. The televised broadcasts showed its audience in both Britain and the U.S. familiar scenes of high-rise buildings and suburban neighborhoods. The recognition of cultural similarities resulted in more positive portrayals of Arabs in both magazines. Also, exposure to human suffering created sympathy for the Lebanese and Palestinians in Lebanon for groups of people previously dehumanized, to some degree, in media images.

This sympathy was reflected in the magazine portrayals in both countries. Several articles included interviews with various Lebanese and Palestinians who had suffered as a result of the invasion. The impact of more sympathetic attitudes and reports of the suffering of that group can be seen in both magazines in the increase in individual referents.

However, a more dramatic shift in the American magazine's referents is seen in a sharp drop in Arab Generally referents between 1973 and 1982 (136 to 48). This drop correlates positively with a rise in Individual, Aggregate

Arab, and Arab State referents. This higher impact of the 1982 invasion of Lebanon on the American magazine than on the British magazine (which showed no drop in Arabs Generally referents and a significant rise only in Individual referents) was suggested by Nick Thimmesch (see page 12). Thimmesch said that because of America's support of Israel, the American people (including journalists) sensed their role in the "slaughter." This sense of guilt, he suggests, could account for the greater impact this event had on the U.S. magazine as compared to the British magazine.

Other factors causing a more diversified portrayal of Arabs in 1982 than in 1973 in both magazines are the focus on the Palestinians, the PLO, and a war in Lebanon which involved other Arab nations. The story could not be told as one of Arabs in general against a common enemy. Too many various Arab groups were competing with each other.

Also, there was a slight increase in religious referents. This is because there was increased involvement of Shiite Moslem groups in military and political maneuvering in Lebanon. Also, Christian fighting was reported.

The American magazine showed a significant increase in the use of Aggregate Arabs as well. Possibly because of the involvement of various groups of Arabs such as the PLO and Amal in political and military operations during this period, Americans became more aware of the intricacy of Arab politics. Consequently, a chi square comparison of "Arabs Generally" and "Aggregate Arabs" (Appendix 3) reveals a significant difference in 1982 but not in 1973.

Sources

Hypothesis 3 (The Economist reflected a higher percentage of Arab sources than Time reflected) was supported by the data. The British magazine in both 1973 and 1982 used more Arab sources than the American magazine. The British magazine also used fewer Israeli sources than Arab sources. That finding is

important because it demonstrates whose story is being told. Time used fewer Arab sources than did The Economist and it also used more Israeli sources than Arab sources.

There are many more Arabs in the world than Israelis. Therefore, the British use of more Arab than Israeli sources is appropriate. American use of more Israeli sources demonstrates the close political ties between the U.S. and Israel. It also may demonstrate a cultural tie.

One may argue that the use of a greater number of Israeli sources than Arab sources reflected the access to those sources by the media. But, if that were the reason, then one must wonder how the British magazine gained access to Arab sources. This does not appear to be the case.

It is more likely, as Said suggested, that the American media portrayal of Arabs and the Middle East situation is colored by America's cultural, political, and economic interests. The use of Israeli sources over Arab sources demonstrates the influence of those interests.

Another finding was that the American magazine used a high number of American sources. Those sources were not only Middle East experts but also various government officials. This reflects the United States' role as a world policy maker. An important aspect for American news on the Middle East is what U.S. officials think about the situation and what they plan to do about it.

In contrast, the British publication did not quote British officials. Their British sources were primarily "experts" on the Middle East. The difference in the two magazine's sources reflects the difference in the world roles of the two nations as suggested by Gerbner, Said, and others.

Also, American media's use of a large number of American sources supports Said's contention that America's cultural and societal ethnocentric processes have been carried into its media.

Descriptive Image Category

Although Hypothesis 4 (The Economist portrays Arabs more favorably than does Time.) was supported by the data, it does not tell the whole story. The British magazine did portray Arabs favorably more often than the American magazine. However, it also portrayed Arabs negatively more frequently than the American magazine. (See Appendix 4). This treatment has less to do with attitudes about Arabs than attitudes about journalism. The Economist's articles provided more commentary and evaluation than Time's articles. This is indicated not only in more value judgments but also in a slightly larger number of "unascertained sources." This means that no source was named except the reporter. The British magazine's articles were written as commentary from the reporter rather than a balancing of quotes from "pro-" and "anti-" sources which was common in the American articles.

Summary of Research Possibilities

This study was actually a preliminary study, testing the use of a comparison approach in analyzing cultural and political influences on the image creation process. The results indicate that this approach would be effective in determining influences on media images which arise from the cultural-political-economic situation in which the images originate. The comparison approach is beneficial in that it distinquishes the influences particular to a country or culture by contrasting those influences with the influences found in another country. Further research could confirm the distinctions between influences on Arab portrayals in American and British news magazines.

Also, different images, time periods, and media could be used to further elaborate on the cultural and political influences on media images. For example, journalists in the Middle East describe a recent shift in American attitudes toward Arabs. Also, the U.S. government has made some realignments

in its allegiances in the Middle East since 1982. Christoper Dickey of Newsweek said, "Since the early 1980s--from the 1983 U.S. Embassy bombing, to the Marine-barracks tragedy, to the U.S. retreat from Beirut--American attitudes toward Arabs have become increasingly negative. In addition, the pro-Israel lobby on Capitol Hill has become stronger."[53] Consequently, many congressmen, with high oil prices no longer a problem, see little benefit in championing the Arabs. According to Dickey, such attitudes in congress plus the rise of Arab terrorism has resulted in a distancing by our government from Arab countries. He suggests that this causes many Americans to no longer make any distinction between moderates and radicals, "lumping them all together in a growing anger against Arabs in general."[54]

A comparative image study such as the one suggested in this paper could examine this more recent period to see if our media suggest any evidence that the attitudes suggested by Dickey exist. In a time when our relations with the Arab world are so precarious, it is important to understand the reasons behind our attitudes. As this study suggests, media images can be a key for examing our own culture and politics. As Socrates said long ago, it is of great benefit to "Know thyself."

--30--

Table 1. Arab Referents

Referent	The Economist, 1973	Time, 1973	The Economist, 1982	Time, 1982
Individuals	67	53	130	131
Aggregate Arabs	45	47	52	145
Arabs Generally	91	136	98	48
Arab States	244	203	245	370
Ethnic Arabs	0	0	2	9
Religious Arabs	1	3	7	9
Other	0	2	1	1

Table 2. Sources

Identified Sources	33	47	45	68
Veiled Sources	15	19	20	48
Unascertained Sources	16	13	18	11
Arab	21	13	29	21
Israeli	13	23	20	36
American	3	17	7	39
European	7	6	10	10
Other	2	7	5	10

Appendix 1

Table 3. Descriptive Image Category

	The Economist, 1973	Time, 1973	The Economist, 1982	Time, 1982
Favorable (+)	55	15	66	43
Unfavorable (-)	110	93	100	76
Neutral (0)	86	102	95	125

Appendix 3

A chi square/cross tabs test comparing "Arabs Generally" and "Aggregate Arabs" categories.

1973

	Arabs Generally	Aggregate Arabs	Totals
The Economist	(97) 91	(39) 45	136
Time	(130) 136	(53) 47	183
	227	92	319

Chi square = 1.0558 (1 degree of freedom)

No significant difference

1982

	Arabs Generally	Aggregate Arabs	Totals
The Economist	(64) 98	(86) 52	150
Time	(82) 48	(111) 145	193
	146	197	343

Chi square = 13. 4812 (1 degree of freedom)

Significant at the .001 level

Appendix 4

A chi square of the Descriptive Image Category

1973	Fav.	Unfav.	Neutral	Totals
	(38)	(110)	(102)	
The Economist	55	110	86	251
	(32)	(93)	(86)	
Time	15	93	102	210
	70	203	188	461

Chi square = 22.1229 (2 degress of freedom)

Significant at the .001 level

1982	Fav.	Unfav.	Neutral	Totals
	(56)	(91)	(114)	
The Economist	66	100	95	261
	(53)	(85)	(106)	
Time	43	76	125	244
	109	176	220	505

Chi square = 12.0879 (2 degrees of freedom)

Significant at the .001 level

Footnotes

[1] Mustafa Gursel, "American Coverage of Foreign News," Nieman Reports, August 1981, p. 56.

[2] Leon T. Hadar, "Behind The New York Times Middle East Coverage," Middle East Review, Summer/Fall 1980, p. 56.

[3] David D. Newsom, "The War in Lebanon," Reporters Under Fire, ed. Landrum R. Bolling (Boulder and London: Westview Press, 1985), p. 19.

[4] Edmund Ghareeb, "The Media and U.S. Perceptions of the Middle East," American-Arab Affairs, 2, Fall 1982, p.78.

[5] Michael J. O'Neill, "Media Power and the Dangers of Mass Information," Nieman Reports, Summer 1985, p. 32.

[6] William H. Read, America's Mass Media Merchants, p. 97.

[7] Alexis S. Tan, Mass Communication theories and Research (New York: John Wiley and Son, Inc., 1985), p. 101.

[8] S. Ball-Rokeach and M. DeFleur, "A Dependency Model of Mass-Media Effects," Communication Research, 3, (1), 1976, p. 3-21.

[9] Edward Said, Covering Islam (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), p. 62.

[10] Ibid., p. 12.

[11] Janice Monti Belkaoui, "Images of Arabs and Israelis in the Prestige Press, 1966-1974," Journalism Quarterly, 55, Winter 1978, p. 732-738, 799.

[12] Ibid., p. 737.

[13] George Gerbner, "Press Perspectives in World Communication: a Pilot Study," Journalism Quarterly, Summer 1961, p. 313.

[14] John C. Merrill, Global Journalism, p. 8.

[15] Jack G. Shaheen, "The 'Instant Arab Kit': the Media Sees Arabs as Billionaires, Bombers, or Belly Dancers," Washington Post, March 19, 1985, p. 19A, col. 1.

[16] Merrill, p. 10.

[17] Walter Lippman, Public Opinion (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922), p. 40.

[18] Soloman Asch, Social Psychology (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952), p. 25.

[19] H. Meenes, "A Comparison of Racial Stereotypes of 1930 and 1942," Journal of Social Psychology, 17, (1943), p. 327-336.

[20]D. W. Seago, "Stereotypes Before Pearl Harbor and After," Journal of Psychology, 23, (1947), p. 53-63.

[21]W. Buchanan and H. Cantrill, How Nations See Other Nations (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953), p. 15.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, Individual in society (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1962), p. 31.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Said, p. 10.

[26]Dennis Ogawa, From Japs to Japanes (Berkley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971), p. 20.

[27]Michael W. Suleiman, "The Effect of American Perceptions of Arabs on Middle East Issues," Split Vision, ed. Edmund Ghareeb (Washington, D.C.: American-Arab Affairs Council, 1983), p. 342.

[28]Kosaka Mastaka, "Amerika o Hagemasu Kai no Teisho," Japan Echo, 8, (1980), p. 102-112.

[29]Irie Akira, "'Beikoku no Jidai' wa Owatta no ka," Sekai, 1, (1980), p. 101-115.

[30]Norman Podhoretz, "J'Accuse," Commentary, September 1982, p. 68.

[31]Nick Thimmesch, "War Coverage in a TV Age," Public Opinion, October/November 1982, p. 93.

[32]Milton Viorst, "The War in Lebanon," Reporters Under Fire, ed. Landrum Bolling (Boulder and London: Westview Press, 1985), p.25.

[33]Roger Morris, "Beirut—and the Press—Under Siege," Columbia Journalism Review, November/December 1982, p. 49.

[34]Everette Dennis, The Media Society: Evidence about Mass Communication in America (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1978), p. 58.

[35]Sidney Kraus and Dennis Davis, The Effects of Mass Communication on Political Behavior (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976), p. 21.

[36]Dennis, p. 58.

[37]V. M. Mishra, "News from the Middle East in Five U.S. Media," Journalism Quarterly, 56, Summer 1979, p. 374-378.

[38]Daniel Sreebny, "American Correspondents in the Middle East: Perceptions and Problems," Journalism Quarterly, 56, Summer 1979, p. 386-388.

[39]Hadar, p. 56-61.

[40]Ghareeb, p. 69-78.

[41]Rita J. Simon, "The Print Media's Coverage of War in Lebanon," Middle East Review, Fall 1983, p. 5-15.

[42]Nick Thimmesch, "The Media and the Middle East," American-Arab Affairs, Fall 1982, p. 70-88.

[43]Ghareeb, p. 72.

[44]Edward Mortimer, "Islam and the Western Journalist," Middle East Journal, 35, March 1981, p. 492-505.

[45]Terence Prittie, "The British Media and the Arab-Israeli Dispute," The Middle East Review, 12, Summer/Fall 1980, p. 67.

[46]Michael Curtis, "The Times of London and Israel: Evenhandedness or Appeasement." Middle East Review, Spring/Summer 1975, p. 80-82.

[47]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 544.

[48]Ibid., p. 550.

[49]Richard Budd, Robert Thorp and Lewis Donohew, Content Analysis of Communications (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967), p. 100.

[50]Issam Sulieman Mousa, The Arab Image in teh US Press (New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 1984), p. 59.

[51]Thimmesch, p. 83.

[52]Belkaoui, p. 733.

[53]Christopher Dickey, "Falling Out of Love with Arabs," Newsweek, August 5, 1986, p. 44.

[54]Ibid., p. 44.